

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. ATT/2001-0203

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendment and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is anticipated or made obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

#### **I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5, 12-20 AND 22-26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 12-20 and 22-26 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Farrell et al. (US patent No. 6,751,663, issued June 15, 2004, herein referred to as "Farrell").

Applicants submit that the rejection is now moot. Responsive to the rejection, Applicants have canceled claims 1-5, 12-20 and 22-26 without prejudice. Applicants reserve the rights to continue prosecution of these cancelled claims in one or more continuation applications. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6-9, 11, 21, 27 AND 28 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-9, 11, 21, 27 and 28 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Specifically, claim 6 is rejected as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Garcea et al. (US Publication 2005/21748). Specifically, claim 7 is rejected as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Leong et al. (US patent 6,269,398) in further view of Schawaller et al. (US patent 5,881,237). Specifically, claim 8 is rejected as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Leong et al., in further view of Schawaller et al. and in further view of Garcea. Specifically, claim 9 is rejected as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Leong et al. Specifically, claim 11 is rejected as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Leong et al., and in further view of Garcea. Specifically, claims 21, 27 and 28 are rejected as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of Diebböll et al. (US Patent 5,886,643).

## PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ATT/2001-0203

Applicants submit that the rejection is now moot. Responsive to the rejection, Applicants have canceled claims 6-9, 11, 21, 27 and 28 without prejudice. Applicants reserve the rights to continue prosecution of these cancelled claims in one or more continuation applications. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

**III. OBJECTION OF CLAIM 10**

The Examiner objected to claim 10 for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Responsive to the Examiner, Applicants have amended claim 10 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants submit that claim 10 is now in allowable form.

**Conclusion**

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

6/22/05

  
Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,400  
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702